## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS HOT SPRINGS DIVISION

DERRICK HOBSON PLAINTIFF

v. Civil No. 04-6148

CAPTAIN STEED; DEPUTY WYNN; DEPUTY SHIRLEY; DEPUTY DUNN; DEPUTY WORLEY; and DEPUTY GRINNESS

**DEFENDANTS** 

## **ORDER**

On January 18, 2007, the plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration (Doc. 38). In his motion, plaintiff asks the court to reconsider the memorandum opinion and judgment entered on January 11, 2007 (Doc. 36 & Doc. 37), granting summary judgment in the defendants' favor and dismissing this case. Plaintiff submits with his motion to reconsider a number of exhibits that he maintains contain "new evidence" establishing why summary judgment in the defendants' favor should be denied.

The court prepared a questionnaire to assist the plaintiff in responding to the defendants' summary judgment motion. (Doc. 34). In addition to responding to specific questions asked by the court, plaintiff was informed that he could submit exhibits to the court and was given an opportunity to provide "any further response" he would like to make to the defendants' summary judgment motion. Plaintiffs' response was received by the court on August 18, 2006 (Doc. 35).

Case 6:04-cv-06148-RTD Document 39 Filed 01/24/07 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 177

The plaintiff's claims stem from his incarceration at the Garland County Detention Facility from June 26, 2004, until January 17, 2005. With the exception of his own affidavit that was notarized on January 17, 2007, all documents attached to the motion to reconsider were in the plaintiff's possession when he responded to the motion for summary judgment. Moreover, the motion to reconsider simply provides no basis for the court to set aside its earlier ruling. The motion to reconsider (Doc. 38) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 24th day of January 2007.

/s/ Robert T. Dawson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE